

KEVIN RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
 United States Attorney  
 EUMI L. CHOI (WVSN 0722)  
 Chief, Criminal Division  
 DEREK R. OWENS (CASBN 230237 )  
 Special Assistant United States Attorney  
 DRIA FEARN  
 Law Clerk  
 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor  
 San Francisco, California 94102  
 Telephone: (415) 436-6488  
 Fax: (415) 436-7234  
 Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CR No.: 05-00726 MAG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<u>STIPULATION AND</u>
	)	<u>PROPOSED ORDER EXCLUDING</u>
	)	<u>TIME</u>
v.	)	
	)	
KHAHILIAH THYJUAN JACKSON,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

On January 27, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from January 27, 2006 to February 10, 2006 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required adequate time for effective assistance of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The

1 parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the  
2 best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

3 SO STIPULATED:

4 KEVIN V. RYAN  
5 United States Attorney

6 DATED: 2/2/06

7 /s/ Dria Fearn  
8 DRIA FEARN  
9 Law Clerk

10 DATED: 2/1/06

11 /s/ Elizabeth M. Falk  
12 ELIZABETH M. FALK  
13 Attorney for Ms. Jackson

14 As the Court found on January 27, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds  
15 that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and  
16 the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act  
17 calculations from January 27, 2006 to February 10, 2006 for effective preparation of defense  
18 counsel and the United States. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the  
19 requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation  
20 and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a  
21 miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

22 SO ORDERED.

23 DATED: 3/15/06

24   
25 JOSEPH C. SPERO  
26 United States Magistrate Judge  
27  
28